



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,166	06/27/2005	Michel Droux	257397US0PCT	6678
22850	7590	09/24/2007	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			COLE, ELIZABETH M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/505,166	DROUX, MICHEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elizabeth M. Cole	1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/29/06;9/20/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-18 in the reply filed on 7/20/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner has no established that it would be burdensome to search both groups and has not indicated that the claims were considered in light of the specification. This is not found persuasive because with regard to lack of unity, considerations regarding whether the search/examination of both groups is burdensome are not pertinent and because, as set forth in the previous action, the examiner has shown that the special technical feature of uniformity set forth in the product claims are not found in the method claims. Limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 4 recites a molecular weight of a polymer but does not state whether the weight is given in terms of weight average or number average. Since these values can differ substantially, the claim is indefinite.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-11, 15-16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gaa et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,810,576. Gaa et al discloses a method of making a chopped strand mat comprising the step of dispersing, in a white water,

chopped strands that are dried after sizing with a sizing liquid comprising an organosilane and a film former, (see col. 9, lines 17-29, col 12, lines 12-17, col. 7, lines 51-52), forming a wet by passing the dispersion over a forming wire, col. 15, lines 16-26, applying a binder and then heat-treating. See col. 13, lines 1-145, col. 4, lines 60-64. With regard to claims 2 and 3, the dried strands include less than 0.01 to 1.5 wt percent of the aqueous treating composition. See claim 19. With regard to claim 5, the fibers can have a length of anywhere from about 1.59 mm to about 76.2 mm. See col. 11, lines 63-66. With regard to claims 6 and 7, the strands are dispersed in the white water in an amount of 0.001-5 weight percent. See col. 12, lines 17-20. With regard to claims 10-11, the mat may comprise binder in an amount of 3-45 percent by weight. See col. 13, lines 35-38. With regard to claim 15-16, the strands comprise glass. See entire document. With regard to claim 18, since the claimed range is 10-50 degrees C and since the Gaa document does not disclose heating or cooling the white water dispersion either before or after the strands are added, it is reasonable to say that the dispersion would have a temperature of about room temperature which would be within the claimed range.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaa as applied to claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-11, 15-16, 18 above, and further in view of Vinamul 8837 product specification. Gaa discloses employing a film forming agent which may comprise a PVA polymer, but does not disclose the claimed molecular weight and solubility. Vinamul 8100 teaches that it is a film forming PVA polymer which is specially designed to be used in chopped strand mats and which has the claimed viscosity and solubility. Since Vinamul is known in the art to be useful in forming chopped strand mats, it would have been obvious to have employed it as the particular film former in Gaa based on its art recognized suitability for this purpose.

7. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaa as applied to claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-11, 15-16, 18 above, and further in view of Dolin, U.S. Patent No. 4,526,914. Gaa differs from the claimed invention because it does not disclose the claimed viscosity, although it does disclose the use of a thickener. See col. 15, lines 16-21. Dolin teaches at col. 1, lines 45-48 that conventionally it is desired that the viscosity of white water is between 2-12 cps which corresponds to the claimed range. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have added the thickener disclosed by Gaa in amounts which produced the viscosity taught by Dolin, since these values were taught in the art as desirable and conventional in forming white water dispersants.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaa as applied to claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-11, 15-16, 18 above, and further in view of Lalwani et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,917,764. Gaa differs from the claimed invention because it does not

disclose the claimed temperature of the heat treating step. Lalwani et al teaches that such heat treating steps are conventionally performed at temperatures such as anywhere from 100-400 degrees C depending on the materials involved. See col. 4, lines 20-29. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have employed temperatures as taught by Lalwani in the invention of Gaa, since such temperatures were known to be conventionally used in the art.

9. Claims 13 –14, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaa as applied to claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-11, 15-16, 18 above, and further in view of Hannes et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,112,174. Gaa differs from the claimed invention because it does not disclose claimed basis weight of the mat and does not disclose claimed number of filaments. Hannes et al disclose basis weights of 100-120 gsm as typical basis weights for such glass mats. See col. 6, lines 58-60. Hannes et al teaches that strands having 1-300 filaments are typical values for such materials. See col. 4, lines 38-40. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have employed the particular types and number of filaments and to have formed the mats to have the claimed basis weights, in view of the teaching of Hannes that such materials and weights were conventionally known and used.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

Mr. Terrel Morris, the examiner's supervisor, may be reached at (571) 272-1478.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300.

/Elizabeth M. Cole/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1771

e.m.c